

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,653	10/29/2003	Michael A. Della Vecchia	P1145/20006	7753 .
3000	7590 11/02/2006		EXAM	INER
CAESAR, RIVISE, BERNSTEIN, COHEN & POKOTILOW, LTD. 11TH FLOOR, SEVEN PENN CENTER 1635 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-2212			MANUEL, GEORGE C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3762	
			DATE MAILED: 11/02/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		\sim			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Assistance	10/696,653	DELLA VECCHIA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	George Manuel	3762			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING E - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS te, cause the application to become ABAND	FION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. FOONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>_</u> .				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Thi	s action is non-final.				
•	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11	I, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims		•			
 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	awn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examina 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposite and accomposite accomposite and accomposite accomposite and accomposite and accomposite accomposite and accomposite accomposit	cepted or b) objected to by to drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Appli prity documents have been rec au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ication No eived in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		nary (PTO-413)			
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/26/06. 		ail Date nal Patent Application			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, the preamble of the claim sets the scope of the claim to be processing an image of an object *in order to perform* a procedure on an object.

Performing the procedure does not appear to be encompassed. This contrasts with the body of the claim in which *performing said procedure* on an object is being positively claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cambier et al (US 6,532,298).

Cambier et al disclose applying a plurality of light beams using an array of light

Art Unit: 3762

sources 202 and providing a corresponding plurality of electrical signals representative of the reflected light beams using imager 200. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to determine image quality metrics using the teaching in Cambier et all because the high-pass filter that also functions as a band-pass filter, selecting only a high range of spatial frequencies in all orientations is modifiable to select metric frequency ranges based on the disclosure of the filter. The filter's center, corresponds to very low spatial frequencies. The low frequencies provide little information in computing a focus score, and only relatively high frequencies contribute significantly to the computation of a focus score. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated by this teaching to adjust the filter to determine a frequency from a plurality of differing frequencies in accordance with a selected image to provide a determined frequency and to determine a plurality of image quality metrics in accordance with the frequency distributions of a plurality of differing frequencies.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-21 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Wildes et al (US 5,571,836) disclose an input image that represents a relatively high-resolution eye image that is applied as an input to an iris localization means from an iris acquisition means. A first data processing step

Application/Control Number: 10/696,653

Art Unit: 3762

Page 4

averages and reduces the input image by convolving the data defining the input image with a low-pass Gaussian filter that spatially averages and reduces high frequency noise.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Manuel whose telephone number is (571) 272-4952.

eorge Manuel Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3762